



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/020,864	10/22/2001	Mark Wurster	2438/1H787-US1	9678
7278	7590	02/13/2006	EXAMINER	
DARBY & DARBY P.C. P. O. BOX 5257 NEW YORK, NY 10150-5257			COBANOGU, DILEK B	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3626	
DATE MAILED: 02/13/2006				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary****Application No.**

10/020,864

**Applicant(s)**

WURSTER, MARK

**Examiner**

Dilek B. Cobanoglu

**Art Unit**

3626

**-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --****Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 October 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-39 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-39 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

### DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-39 have been examined.

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

3. Claims 1-5, 7-9, 11-39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being unpatentable by Surwit et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,980,958 B1).

A. As per claim 1, Surwit et al. discloses a method for using an administration of anticoagulation medication system accessed via a computer terminal over a network, the method comprising the steps of:

- i. receiving current information for each patient's visit (Surwit et al.; col. 3, lines 42-50 and col. 4, lines 47-50); and
- ii. automatically calculating a new weekly dose medication regimen based on the received information (Surwit et al.; col. 28, lines 33-39).

B. As per claim 2, Surwit et al. discloses the method in accordance with claim 1, wherein the information received includes at least one of a patient's current weekly anticoagulation medication dose, current international normalized ratio,

and international normalized ratio goal (Surwit et al.; col. 4, lines 47-50 and col. 28, lines 33-39).

C. As per claim 3, Surwit et al. discloses the method in accordance with claim 2, wherein the new weekly dose medication regimen is based on at least one of the patient's current weekly anticoagulation medication dose, current international normalize ratio, and international normalized ratio goal (Surwit et al.; col. 28, lines 33-39).

D. As per claim 4, Surwit et al. discloses the method in accordance with claim 1, wherein the new weekly dose medication regimen is calculated based on a equation customizable by each user (Surwit et al.; col. 28, lines 33-48).

E. As per claim 5, Surwit et al. discloses the method in accordance with claim 1, further comprising displaying standard medical guidelines in response to a user's request (Surwit et al.; col. 8, lines 32-38).

F. As per claim 7, Surwit et al. discloses the method in accordance with claim 1, further comprising converting the new weekly dose medication into daily doses based on a number of milligrams in a single pill (Surwit et al.; col. 28, lines 45-48).

G. As per claim 8, Surwit et al. discloses the method in accordance with claim 7, wherein said converting step further comprises receiving from a user over the network a setting of a predetermined number of milligrams in a single pill as defined by the user (Surwit et al.; col. 28, lines 39-48 and col. 9, lines 44-52).

H. As per claim 9, Surwit et al. discloses the method in accordance with claim 1, wherein the anticoagulation medication is low molecular weight heparin (Surwit et al.; col. 4, lines 18-33 and Applicant's specification, page 4).

Examiner considers that warfarin is one of low molecular weight heparin, since it's mentioned in Applicant's specification, page 4, line 12-15.

I. As per claim 11, Surwit et al. discloses the method in accordance with claim 1, further comprising displaying a list of patients that are overdue for a scheduled visit as of a current date (Surwit et al.; col. 13, lines 48-51 and col. 19, lines 10-22).

J. As per claim 12, Surwit et al. discloses the method in accordance with claim 11, wherein the scheduled visit is overdue if delayed more than a predetermined number of days, as defined by a user, relative to a current date (Surwit et al.; col. 19, lines 10-22).

K. As per claim 13, Surwit et al. discloses the method in accordance with claim 1, wherein the current information includes updated medication information (Surwit et al.; col. 9, lines 18-29), the method further comprising automatically displaying medication interaction messages in response to receiving the updated medication information (Surwit et al.; col. 10, lines 42-52 and col. 20, lines 8-13).

L. As per claim 14, Surwit et al. discloses the method in accordance with claim 1, further comprising displaying a list of patients scheduled for a visit on a current date (Surwit et al.; col. 13, lines 39-60).

M. As per claim 15, Surwit et al. discloses the method in accordance with claim 14, further comprising selecting a particular patient from the list of patients scheduled (Surwit et al.; col. 12, line 60 to col. 13, line 10).

N. As per claim 16, Surwit et al. discloses the method in accordance with claim 1, further comprising generating a report of at least one of patient, physician, and clinic summary information (Surwit et al.; col. 19, lines 27-42).

O. As per claim 17, Surwit et al. discloses the method in accordance with claim 16, wherein said report is customizable as to which fields are to be included therein (Surwit et al.; col. 12, line 60 to col. 13, line 10).

P. As per claim 18, Surwit et al. discloses the method in accordance with claim 17, wherein said report is customizable in at least one of sorting and grouping of the fields included therein (Surwit et al.; col. 12, line 60 to col. 13, line 10).

Q. As per claim 19, Surwit et al. discloses the method in accordance with claim 1, further comprising the steps of:

- i. accessing the system via a web site (Surwit et al.; col. 11, lines 15-20); and
- ii. receiving a selection of preferences to customize configuration of the web site (Surwit et al.; col. 12, line 60 to col. 13, line 10).

R. As per claim 20, Surwit et al. discloses the method in accordance with claim 1, further comprising automatically calculating a scheduled return visit based on whether the new weekly dose medication regimen has changed relative to the

current weekly anticoagulation medication dose (Surwit et al.; col. 10, lines 33-41).

S. As per claim 37, Surwit et al. discloses a system for administration of anticoagulation medication accessed via a computer terminal over a network, comprising: a processor for receiving current information for each patient's visit and automatically calculating a new weekly dose medication regimen based on the received information (Surwit et al.; col. 10, lines 14-18 and lines 33-41).

T. As per claim 38, Surwit et al. discloses the system in accordance with claim 37, wherein the current information received includes at least one of a patient's current weekly anticoagulation medication dose, current international normalized ratio, and international normalized ratio goal (Surwit et al.; col. 4, lines 47-50 and col. 28, lines 33-39).

U. As per claim 39, Surwit et al. discloses the system in accordance with claim 38, wherein the new weekly dose medication regimen is based on at least one of the patient's current weekly anticoagulation medication dose, current international normalized ratio, and international normalized ratio goal (Surwit et al.; col. 28, lines 33-39).

4. As per claims 21-36, they are system claims, which repeat the same limitations of claims 1-4, 7-9, 11-20, the corresponding method claims, as a collection of elements as opposed to a series of process steps. Since the teachings of Surwit et al. disclose the underlying process steps that constitute the methods of claims 1-4, 7-9, 11-20, it is respectfully submitted that they provide the underlying structural elements that perform

the steps as well. As such, the limitations of claims 21-36 are rejected for the same reasons given above for claims 1-4, 7-9, 11-20.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 6 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Surwit et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,980,958 B1) in view of Baruch (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0077849).

A. As per claim 6, Surwit et al. discloses the method in accordance with claim 5.

Surwit et al. fails to expressly teach the standard medical guidelines published by American College of Chest Physicians, per se, since it appears that Surwit et al. is more directed to other guidelines such as Guidelines for the Diagnosis and Management of Asthma (Surwit et al.; col. 8, lines 32-38). However, this feature is well known in the art, as evidenced by Baruch.

In particular, Baruch discloses a standard medical guidelines published by American College of Chest Physicians (Baruch; paragraph 0065 and 0068).



It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have combined the guidelines such as Guidelines for the Diagnosis and Management of Asthma with the American College of Chest Physicians with the motivation of examining healthcare practitioner's adherence to national guidelines in prevention of disease, while also providing real time feedback (Baruch; paragraph 0065).

B. As per claim 10, Surwit et al. discloses the method in accordance with claim 1.

Surwit et al. fails to expressly teach the database of patient records based on at least one of patient's last name, patient's first name, medical record number, social security number and patient identification, per se, since it appears that Surwit et al. is more directed to databases for storing and manipulating patient data (Surwit et al.; col. 11, lines 15-20 and lines 28-36). However, this feature is well known in the art, as evidenced by Baruch.

In particular, Baruch discloses searching a database of patient records based on at least one of patient's last name, patient's first name, medical record number, social security number and patient identification (Baruch; paragraph 52).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have combined the databases for storing and manipulating patient data with the a database of patient records based on

at least one of patient's last name, patient's first name, medical record number, social security number and patient identification with the motivation of lower the cost of medical malpractice and facility error rates (Baruch; paragraph 0053, lines 35-37).

### ***Conclusion***

7. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. The cited but not used prior art teach "Pharmacy drug management system providing patient specific drug dosing, drug interaction analysis, order generation, and patient data matching" 2001/0001144, "Systems and methods for electronic health management" 2002/0010597, "Individualized patient electronic medical records system" 6,523,009 B1, "Systems and methods for screening for adverse effects of a treatment" 6,656,122 B2, "Pharmaceutical formulation comprising a low molecular weight thrombin inhibitor and its prodrug" 6,962,905 B1, "Computer implemented patient medication review system and process for the managed care, health care and/or pharmacy industry" 6,014,631 A, "Systems, methods and computer program products for guiding the selection of therapeutic treatment regimens" 6,081,786 A, "Medication compliance monitoring device having conductive traces upon a frangible backing of a medication compartment" 4,616,316 A.

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Dilek B. Cobanoglu whose telephone number is 571-272-8295. The examiner can normally be reached on 8-4:30.


Art Unit: 3626

9. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Joseph Thomas can be reached on 571-272-6776. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

10. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

*DBC*

DBC  
Art Unit 3626  
02/03/2006

  
C. LUKE GILLIGAN  
PATENT EXAMINER